## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS GALVESTON DIVISION

§	
§	
§	
§	
§	C.A. NO. 3:13-cv-349
§	
§	
§	
§	
	§ §

## PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS IN LIMINE

Plaintiff Donald Broussard moves the Court to order, before voir dire, that (1) Defendant's attorneys, and through them, any and all witnesses called for Defendant, refrain from commenting on, mentioning, communicating, publishing, or attempting to introduce evidence of, directly or indirectly, the matters in this Motion; and (2) Defendant's attorneys instruct their witnesses not to volunteer, inject, disclose, state, or mention the matters in this Motion in the presence of the jury, unless and until specifically questioned thereon. Plaintiff asks the Court to order that, if Defendant's attorneys intend to offer evidence of the matters in this Motion, they must first obtain a favorable ruling from the Court outside the presence and hearing of all prospective jurors and the jurors ultimately selected in this civil action.

In support of this Motion, Plaintiff shows as follows:

## A.

The matters in this motion are inadmissible for any purpose on proper and timely objection because they are not relevant to the issue in this case or the rights of the parties. The matters in this Motion will not have any tendency to make the existence of any material fact more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence. *See* Fed. R. Evid.

401 and 402. Permitting interrogation of the witnesses, comments to the jurors, or offers of evidence on the matters in this Motion is substantially outweighed by the harm to Plaintiff. Instead, it would draw the jury's attention to the prejudicial impact. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 101 & 103(c). If Defendant injects the matters in this Motion into this trial through a party, and attorney or a witness, Defendant will cause irreparable harm to Plaintiff, which no jury instruction would cure. If any of the matters in this Motion are brought to the attention of the jury, directly or indirectly, Plaintiff would be forced to move for a mistrial. To avoid prejudice and a possible mistrial, Plaintiff asks the Court to grant his Motion in Limine.

B.

The following matters are the subject of this Motion in Limine:

Agreed	Granted	Modified	Denied
References to	persons or the purp	orted testimony of p	ersons who have n
		orted testimony of p  Defendant's respon	
properly and	timely disclosed in	• •	nses to Plaintiff's

References or attempting to introduce documents or tangible things or the contents of documents or tangible things that have not been properly and timely produced or made available to Plaintiff in Defendant's Rule 26 disclosures or in Defendant's responses to Plaintiff's written discovery. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 37.

References to experts or the purported testimony of any expert who has not identified or whose status as an expert has not been disclosed to Plaintiff. See It Civ. P. 37; Alldread v. City of Grenada, 988 F.2d. 1425, 1435-36 (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993)  Agreed Granted Modified Denied  Expert-witness opinions that have not been disclosed to Plaintiff or are otherwithe scope of the expert's written opinion produced during pretrial discovery. St. R. Civ. P. 37; Alldread v. City of Grenada, 988 F.2d 1425, 1435-36 (5th Cir. Thudium v. Allied Products Corp. 36 F.3d 797, 769-70 (8th Cir. 1994)	Agreed	Granted	Modified	Denied
Expert-witness opinions that have not been disclosed to Plaintiff or are otherw the scope of the expert's written opinion produced during pretrial discovery. Sol. R. Civ. P. 37; Alldread v. City of Grenada, 988 F.2d 1425, 1435-36 (5th Cir.	identified or w	hose status as an expe	ert has not been disclo	sed to Plaintiff. See
the scope of the expert's written opinion produced during pretrial discovery. Se R. Civ. P. 37; Alldread v. City of Grenada, 988 F.2d 1425, 1435-36 (5th Cir.	Agreed	Granted	Modified	 Denied
Agrand Granted Modified Danied	E	s opinions that have no	ot been disclosed to P	laintiff or are otherw
	the scope of th R. Civ. P. 37;	e expert's written opin Alldread v. City of G	nion produced during renada, 988 F.2d 142	pretrial discovery. <i>S</i> 25, 1435-36 (5th Cir.
References or questioning that suggest or implies that Plaintiff or his witnesses, relatives, agents, employees, attorneys, or representatives have accused of, or have been found guilty of, any crimes or criminal conduct. <i>See</i> Evid. 402, 403, 404, 608, and 609. <i>U.S. v. Carter</i> , 528 F.2d 844, 846-47 (\$1975).	the scope of the R. Civ. P. 37; Thudium v. Alia Agreed  References or witnesses, relaccused of, or	He expert's written opin Alldread v. City of Glied Products Corp. 36  Granted  Granted  The questioning that substitutes, agents, employed have been found guilt	mion produced during renada, 988 F.2d 142 F.3d 797, 769-70 (8t Modified Modified byees, attorneys, or y of, any crimes or cri	pretrial discovery. S 5, 1435-36 (5th Cir. h Cir. 1994)  Denied  at Plaintiff or his representatives have iminal conduct. See

The Defendant not make reference to, mention, elicit, testimony, or present evidence of any personal habits, character traits, and any crimes, arrests, convictions, wrongs or acts of Plaintiff, any witness called by Plaintiff, or Plaintiff's family members, including, but not limited to, smoking, fighting, drinking alcoholic beverages, womanizing, prior marriages, abortions, illegitimate children, traffic violations, illegal drug use, drug and/or alcohol rehabilitation programs, criminal acts, criminal charges, criminal convictions, and swearing. There is no evidence or allegation that those habits, character traits, crimes, wrongs, or acts, if any, contributed in any way to the occurrence made the basis of this suit or are relevant to the determination of any issue in this suit. Furthermore, the probative value of those matters is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, and misleading the jury. This type of evidence would only be offered for the impermissible purpose of portraying Plaintiff, his witnesses, or Plaintiff's family members as bad persons. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 404, 608(b), and 609(a).

Agreed	Granted	Modified	Denied
testimony, or or prior marriage would be offer	offering any evidence is or past romantic re ered only for the in	relating to Plaintiff or elationships. Such mapermissible purpose	ce to, mentioning, elice any of Plaintiff's with natters are not relevant of portraying Plainti 03, 404, 406, and 609.
Agreed	Granted	Modified	 Denied
Any reference source.	to the fact that Plaint	iff receives any benef	its from any other colla
Agreed	Granted	Modified	 Denied
witnesses, rela report income assessment and	tives, agents, employ to the Internal Revent	vees, attorneys, or repute Service or any other rhave not filed state of	es that Plaintiff or his expresentatives have failed agency responsible for federal income tax re
Agreed	Granted	Modified	Denied
	•		t or judgment in this la ges. <i>See</i> Fed. R. Evid.

12) The Defendant not make reference to, mention, elicit, testimony, or present evidence of any prior lawsuits, claims, workers' compensation claims, disability claims, unemployment claims, or any similar claims made by or on behalf of Plaintiff. There is no evidence or allegation that those claims, if any, contributed in any way to the occurrence made the basis of this suit or are relevant to the determination of any issue

Agreed	Granted	Modified	Denied
must be the Defendant to	sole proximate cause be liable or for Plainti	or suggesting to the just of Plaintiff's damag ff to recover damages. calculated to falsely a	es or injuries in or This argument wor
Agreed	Granted	Modified	Denied
are irrelevant and prejudicia	al to Plaintiff's right	ese matters are generate to a fair and imparti	ılly inadmissible, iri al trial. If relevant
are irrelevant and prejudicia admissible, the the danger of	and prejudicial. The al to Plaintiff's right be probation value of	ese matters are genera	ally inadmissible, in al trial. If relevant d be greatly outweig

"pay some r trying to imp and procedur claim upon	noney and make up a oly that this lawsuit is res of summary judgme	lawsuit against anoth "frivolous" or "witho ents, counter claims, di	to the jury that anyone er without any legal baut merit." Proper remeismissal for failing to stavailable to the Defenda
Agreed	Granted	Modified	 Denied
	ion that Plaintiff could apy by getting his lawy		additional medical car se to pay for it.
Agreed	Granted	 Modified	 Denied

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, Plaintiff moves this Court to order, before voir dire, that (1) Defendant's attorneys and, through them, any and all witnesses called for Defendant, refrain from commenting on, mentioning, communicating, publishing, or attempting to introduce evidence of, directly or indirectly, the matters in this Motion, without first obtaining a favorable ruling from the Court outside the presence and hearing of all jurors or prospective jurors; and (2) Defendant's attorneys instruct their witnesses not to volunteer, inject, disclose, state, or mention the matters in this Motion in the presence of the jury, unless and until specifically questioned thereon.

Respectfully Submitted,

ARNOLD & ITKIN LLP

/s/ Kurt B. Arnold

Kurt B. Arnold Attorney-In-Charge SBN: 24036150 SDTX: 36185

karnold@arnolditkin.com ARNOLD & ITKIN LLP 6009 Memorial Drive Houston, Texas 77007 Tel: 713.222.3800

Fax: 713.222.3850

\*For electronic service use: e-service@arnolditkin.com

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

OF COUNSEL:

Caj D. Boatright SBN: 24036237 SDTX: 650384

cboatright@arnolditkin.com

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on December 22, 2014, I electronically filed the foregoing pleading with the Clerk of Court, using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to all counsel of record.

/s/ Kurt B. Arnold

Kurt B. Arnold